



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

later books, especially where the *Ambrosianus* fails, will appear from the following jottings which I have culled from my notes. The reading given is in each case that found in the *Harleianus*.

VI Prooem. §4: *nisi quod* (for *quam quod*). This should be restored to the text, especially as I am able to report that it is also the reading of the *Bambergensis* (G), as well as of V and S: *ibid.* §7 *quam* for *quod* (A G). At i, §43, H is the only MS that shows *inquit*, hitherto credited to the *ed. Campana*: cf. §47 *ita neque* (with P V) *itaque ne*.

V Prooem. §1 *gratia* (with A) for *vel ira*. Here the second hand in Bg. has *vel gratia*. At 4, §1, we have another remarkable instance of reversion to A: *altera quaestionem vel falsa* A H, where Bg. shows *quaestionem* written over the words of the text *etiam causam*. Cf. i. 4, §24: *computabo* (with A) for *putabo*: 7, §33 *agentibus* (with A P) for *agendi* (B).

Moreover, for the early part of the first book, where the *Bambergensis* almost entirely fails, H should be quoted in its stead: e.g., Pr. §5 *feri oratorem non posse*, §14 *sapientiae studiosi*, §25 *demonstraturi*. Again in the Prooemium §4 H shows *summ (ā i) neloquentie*; the archetype probably had *summam eloquentiae*, for the passage relied on at x. 1. 97 to support *summam in eloquentia* is not exactly parallel. At i. 1. 19 H supports the vulgate *per singulos annos prorogatum*: and gives at i. 2. 4: *nam et potest turpis esse domesticus ille praeceptor*. At i. 3. 14 it has *discipulis* for *discentis*.

Radermacher makes generous reference to the labors of his predecessors. He holds fast (Praef., p. vi) to the established division of the MSS into three main families, and gives reasons (p. xi) why A should not always be preferred to B. Moreover, his careful selection of authorities has enabled him very considerably to simplify the critical apparatus. In particular, references to the *edd. vett.* are now in the main superfluous, as their readings in important places have been traced to one or other of the numerous MSS by which our knowledge of Quintilian's text has become enlarged.

W. PETERSON

McGILL UNIVERSITY, MONTREAL

November 1, 1907

Renkema's Observationes criticae et exegeticae ad C. Valerii Flacci Argonautica. Traiecti ad Rhenum, 1906. Pp. 63. M. 3.

This pamphlet on Valerius Flaccus' epic comes not inopportunately at no great distance of time from the publication of Giarratano's epoch-making edition of the text (1904). Renkema adds several new emendations to the already large collection recorded by Giarratano. I cannot

honestly say that any of them seems to me convincing, but the discussion of crucial passages which accompanies them is scholarly and suggestive. Renkema naturally deals with many of the points raised by Langen's usually trustworthy commentary (1890), and his criticisms appear to me to raise real questions and to open up solutions which may be right. In other cases his disputation is less to the point and its result unsatisfactory. For instance, it may be true — and probably is — that *sacrae harenae* (iv. 230) can scarcely mean that the shore where Pollux is to fight with Amycus is consecrated because of the *religious* character of the spectacle; but that is no reason for interpreting *sacrae* as "accursed." The very similar passage quoted by Renkema (iv. 746) where the shore is called *saeuae*, suggests that in iv. 230 *sacrae* is an error for *saeuae*. The *crux* in iv. 136 *reges preme dure secundos* is not likely to be a corruption of *rex te premet arte secunda*, even if *treme* is rejected as not sufficiently accounting for *secundos*. And who can believe that in iv. 366 f. where MSS give *Muneris ille potens custodem protinus Argum Adiungit custos Argus placet*, we are to substitute *acrem* for *Argum*? But at iv. 507 *tonuit cum forte Veseui Hesperiae letalis apex*, where Langen absurdly believed *forte* to be an adjectival adverb, Renkema has an excellent discussion on *cum forte* which he shows from *Aen.* ix. 437, xi. 450 to be especially used in similes and not open to any real doubt in the passage of Valerius.

ROBINSON ELLIS

OXFORD

Die Eumeniden des Aischylos. Erklärende Ausgabe. Von FRIEDRICH BLASS. Berlin: Weidmann, 1907. Pp. 179. M. 5.

Blass's posthumous *Eumenides* is marked by the terseness, directness, and avoidance of mere erudition which distinguished his *Choephoron* (*Class. Philol.*, Vol. I, p. 440).

The Introduction sets forth clearly how the hero-drama is transformed into a Götterdrama symbolical of the advance from the old to the new moral order. The resemblance of Aeschylus' ideas to those expressed by Plato in the *Laws* is emphasized. The Areopagus passage is taken as a protest against the reforms of Ephialtes, not as a warning against going farther. Changes of scene take place not only at l. 63 by the ecyclema, and after l. 234 from Delphi to Athens, but by implication from Athena's temple to the Areopagus after 566. The independence of *fgh* from M is maintained.

Among the more notable readings or interpretations accepted are: 21: εὐλόγως for ἐν λόγοις; 294: οὐ κατηρεφῇ (notes μῆ) for ἤ; 304: σκαῖ for σκιά; 494: νῦν μεταστροφαι νέων θεσμίων, ἣ κρατήσῃ δίκᾱ <τε> καὶ βλάβᾱ,